

REMARKS

Claim 16 has been amended to recite that the purifier flow channel is disposed in the flow path between the eluent source reservoir and the sample injector. This is disclosed, e.g. in Fig. 6 and the description of Fig. 6 at pages 10 and 11 of the present specification.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite that the charged barrier along the purifying flow channel is of the same charge as the chromatography separation medium exchangeable ions. This is disclosed at specification page 6, lines 15-22, in which the exchangeable ions of resin bed 18 are anions and barrier 24 is anionic.

Claim 22 has been amended to recite that the ion exchange medium in the purifying flow channel is of the same charge as the chromatographic separation medium exchangeable ions. This is the same charge relationship as that of the barrier and chromatography separation medium exchangeable ions of Claim 16 supported at page 6 of the specification. This same charge relationship is inherent because the flow-through ion exchange medium of Claim 22 (e.g. packed bed) is disclosed to be an alternative embodiment of the electrolytic embodiments using a charged barrier as set forth in Claim 18. (See the specification at page 11, lines 20-25, and the subsequent detailed description in the specification.)

Claim 25 has been amended to correct a typographical error. The word “fist” has been changed to “first.”

In the August 23, 2006 office action, Claims 16-26 were rejected as being anticipated by Anderson (US 6,468,804). Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation that the purifier is upstream and downstream of the injector because of the recycle loop. That is not how a person of ordinary skill would interpret the term “upstream”. Further, Anderson does not teach a purifier and a suppressor as recited in Claim 26.

To expedite prosecution, Claim 16 has been amended to recite that the purifier flow channel is disposed in the flow path between the eluent source reservoir and the sample injector. This is neither disclosed nor suggested by Anderson which discloses a suppressor which must be downstream of the sample injector.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite that the charged barrier along the purifying flow channel is of the same charge as the chromatographic separation medium exchangeable ions. No charged barrier is disclosed in Anderson. Further, the suppressor of Anderson has exchangeable ions of opposite charge to the exchangeable ions of the chromatographic medium. This opposite charge relationship is essential to the function of the Anderson suppressor. Otherwise, the analyte ions would be removed in the suppressor.

Referring to amended Claim 22, the flow-through ion exchange medium in the purifying flow channel is of the same charge as the chromatography medium exchangeable ions. This is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Anderson system which requires an opposite charge relationship between the exchangeable ions of the disclosed suppressor and chromatography separation medium, required to perform a suppressor function.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-442-1000.

Respectfully submitted,



David J. Brezner, Reg. No. 24,774

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
One Market, Spear Street Tower
San Francisco, California 94105
Tel: 415-442-1000
Fax: 415-442-1001

1-SF/7447743.1